

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.msyolo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/355,149	03/07/2000	ULF ASSMUS	2345/87	6071
26646 7590 02/16/2011 KENYON & KENYON LLP ONE BROADWAY			EXAMINER	
			LEE, MICHAEL	
NEW YORK, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2422	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/16/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/355,149	ASSMUS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
M. Lee	2422	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 28 January 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. Me reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1: schecked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
Examiner Note: It box 1 is criecked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension is under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action: or (2) as set forth in (b) above; if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the malling date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>28 January 2011</u> . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37 (a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37 (e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
AMENDMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (F10E-324). Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
Applicant's Tephy has overcome the billowing rejection(s). — would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. \(\subseteq For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \(\subseteq \) will not be entered, or b) \(\subseteq \) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-9 and 18.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
- REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
- 13. A Other: The rejections to the claims are still remained the same.

/M. Lee/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2422 Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding applicants argument that the Suzuki reference does not identically describe that such a device stores the received data for the required period of time such that a period between two disturbances is made long that any effect of the two disturbances is reduced, it is respectfully disagreed. As shown in Figure 8, the time period. Tro, in between ERP pusies ERPn+1 and ERPn+2 is disturbed because it has shorter time period than its normal Trc. In order to avoid the disturbances, the shorter Trc is made longer as shown in bottom row of Figure 8 (note the Trc with the word DISCARD attached). Regardless what's being performed inside the new Trc period, its time period is longer than the disturbed Trc. Hence, the forecoind limitation is clearly met by Suzuki.

Regarding applicant's argument that the Suzuki reference appears to teach away from the present invention of the use of a dataindependent clock, i.e., the studio clock signal which is sent to the memory device for reading data, in that the Suzuki reference recites that using the control unit to initialize the buffer is "disadvantageous" because such initialization will cause the buffer to discard other cell data and the operation of the first and second ATM circuit stops during initialization, it is relayed to the first and second ATM circuit stops during initialization, it is relayed to the first and second ATM circuit on the stops during initialization, it is relayed to the control of the stop of the